

## Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 OECD P 01464 01 OF 02 171502Z  
ACTION EB-07

INFO OCT-01 CIAE-00 COME-00 DODE-00 EUR-12 NSAE-00 USIA-06  
TRSE-00 ERDA-05 ISO-00 ACDA-07 EA-07 OES-06 /051 W  
-----171513Z 066624 /42  
R 171559Z JAN 77  
FM USMISSION OECD PARIS  
TO SECSTATE WASH DC 4953

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 01 OF 02 OECD PARIS 01464

EXCON

E.O. 11652: XGDS1  
TAGS: ESTC, COCOM  
SUBJECT: UK PROPOSAL ON ORGANIZATION OF LIST REVIEWS

REFS: A) STATE 2916, B) COCOM DOC. PROC (76) 8

SUMMARY. IN CLARIFICATION OF QUESTIONS RAISED BY  
DEPARTMENT, UKDEL EXPLAINED THAT 1) UK PROPOSALS WOULD NOT  
PREVENT SUBMISSION OF RECENT TECHNICAL DATA DURING LIST  
REVIEW, 2) SECONDING REQUIREMENT WOULD ENSURE THAT PRO-  
POSALS HAD PROPER SUPPORT AND NEED NOT PROLONG REVIEW,  
AND 3) POINT VII WOULD ALLOW COMMITTEE TO CHANGE DATE FOR  
START OF ROUND II IN LIGHT OF PROGRESS MADE IN ROUND ONE.  
END SUMMARY.

1. IN PRIVATE CONVERSATION JANUARY 14 WITH UK REGULAR  
DEL MICHAEL PRICE, USDEL PROBED THE POINTS RAISED IN  
DEPARTMENT'S REF A. CONVERSATION WAS REASONABLY SATIS-  
FACTORY, ALTHOUGH ONE POINT, DISCUSSED BELOW, REMAINED  
UNCLEAR.

2. PARAGRAPH II(F)(1) OF UK PROPOSAL IS NOT RPT NOT  
INTENDED TO BAR SUBMISSION OF NEW TECHNICAL DATA DURING  
LIST REVIEW, PRICE SAID. LANGUAGE IN QUESTION IS  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 OECD P 01464 01 OF 02 171502Z

DIRECTED RATHER AT TARDY COUNTERPROPOSALS NOT CLEARLY  
RELATED TO FACTS OR INFORMATION ALREADY DISCUSSED. UK  
HAD IN MIND LAST-MINUTE COUNTERPROPOSALS BY US IN 1974  
REVIEW. WHEN PRESSED, HOWEVER, ON PRECISE MEANING OF  
PHRASE "NEW SUBJECT MATTER", PRICE ADMITTED HE DID NOT  
FULLY UNDERSTAND IT AND SAID HE WOULD ASK LONDON TO  
CLARIFY IT.

3. PRICE EXPLAINED THAT PURPOSE OF SECONDING REQUIREMENT WAS TO ENSURE IN ADVANCE THAT ALL PROPOSALS HAD "SUBSTANTIAL" SUPPORT, AND THUS TO AVOID TIME-WASTING DISCUSSION OF THOSE THAT FAILED OF ACCEPTANCE BY ANY BUT SUBMITTING DELEGATION. HE READILY ACKNOWLEDGED THAT THIS REQUIREMENT COULD LEAD TO BARGAINING BUT DID NOT THINK, APPARENTLY, THAT IT WAS AN IMPORTANT DRAWBACK. DISCUSSIONS ON SECONDING COULD TAKE PLACE BEFORE SUBMISSION, AND IN CAPITALS, NOT NECESSARILY WITH EXPERTS PRESENT, LIKE BILATERALS. THAT HAVE NORMALLY PRECEDED PAST LIST REVIEWS. A SECONDING DELEGATION WOULD INDEED BE BOUND TO SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL IN PRINCIPLE; HENCE PRESUMABLY, SAID PRICE, IT WOULD NOT WISH TO SUBMIT A COUNTERPROPOSAL OF ITS OWN. BUT IT COULD ALSO PROPOSE AMENDMENTS IF DISCUSSION INDICATED THEY WOULD ENHANCE ITS PROSPECTS OF ACCEPTANCE BY ALL DELS. HE MINIMIZED THE DANGER SUGGESTED BY USDEL OF A MINI-LIST REVIEW BEFORE THE LIST REVIEW.

4. ON LAST POINT RAISED IN REF A (PARA 3), PRICE EXPLAINED THAT PURPOSE OF POINT VII IS TO ALLOW COMMITTEE TO MOVE STARTING DATE FOR ROUND TWO (TENTATIVELY AGREED BEFORE ROUND ONE) FORWARD OR BACK IN LIGHT OF ENDING DATE OF ROUND ONE, AND OF PROGRESS MADE IN THAT ROUND.

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 OECD P 01464 02 OF 02 171455Z  
ACTION EB-07

INFO OCT-01 CIAE-00 COME-00 DODE-00 NSAE-00 USIA-06 TRSE-00  
EUR-12 ERDA-05 ISO-00 EA-07 ACDA-07 OES-06 /051 W  
-----171513Z 066580 /44

R 171559Z JAN 77  
FM USMISSION OECD PARIS  
TO SECSTATE WASH DC 4954

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 02 OF 02 OECD PARIS 01464

EXCON

5. USDEL COMMENT: AFTER CONVERSATION JUST REPORTED,  
USDEL FEARS MORE THAN EVER THAT PROPOSED SECONDING

REQUIREMENTS ARE NOT WORKABLE. THEY MAY BE WORKABLE FOR PROPOSALS AIMED MERELY AT RAISING, LOWERING, OR OTHERWISE MODIFYING AN EXISTING PARAMETER. BUT MORE COMPLEX PROPOSALS WHICH WOULD CHANGE THE BASIC CONCEPT OF EMBARGO COVERAGE OF AN ITEM, OR EXTEND COVERAGE OF EQUIPMENT NOT NOW COVERED, MIGHT WITHER ON THE VINE FOR

DISCUSSIONS TO OBTAIN A SECONDER FOR SUCH PROPOSALS MIGHT BE FAR MORE TIME CONSUMING THAN PRICE ADMITS.

6. WITH THIS EXCEPTION, USDEL REMAINS OF OPINION THAT REST OF UK PROPOSALS ARE WORKABLE (SUBJECT TO ANY NEEDED CLARIFICATION, AS IN PARAGRAPH 2 ABOVE) AND WOULD FACILITATE FUTURE LIST REVIEWS. TO REJECT THEM, OR ANY SIGNIFICANT PART OF THEM, WOULD INEVITABLY RAISE QUESTIONS AS TO US GOOD FAITH AND POSSIBILITY OF HAVING ANOTHER LIST REVIEW AT ALL. ON OTHER HAND, AN EVEN MORE IMPORTANT QUESTION IS WHETHER THE WILL EXISTS ON THE US SIDE TO COMPLY WITH DEADLINES AFTER AGREEING TO THEM. IN 1975, AFTER AGREEING TO DEADLINES FOR SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS AND COUNTERPROPOSALS, AND AFTER GIVING

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 OECD P 01464 02 OF 02 171455Z

ASSURANCES OF ITS INTENTION TO LIVE UP TO THEM, THE US VIOLATED THEM REPEATEDLY. THE QUESTION IS, WILL THE US LIVE UP TO FUTURE UNDERTAKINGS?  
KATZ

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01-Jan-1994 12:00:00 am  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** REPORTS, PROPOSALS (BID), STRATEGIC TRADE CONTROLS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Sent Date:** 17-Jan-1977 12:00:00 am  
**Decaption Date:** 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 22 May 2009  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1977OECDP01464  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** X1  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Expiration:**  
**Film Number:** D770016-1198  
**Format:** TEL  
**From:** OECD PARIS  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1977/newtext/t19770145/aaaabnpx.tel  
**Line Count:** 147  
**Litigation Code IDs:**  
**Litigation Codes:**  
**Litigation History:**  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Message ID:** 85ccf2d8-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Office:** ACTION EB  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** 77 STATE 2916  
**Retention:** 0  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 28-Feb-2005 12:00:00 am  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**SAS ID:** 3581398  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** UK PROPOSAL ON ORGANIZATION OF LIST REVIEWS  
**TAGS:** ESTC, COCOM  
**To:** STATE  
**Type:** TE  
**vdkgvwkey:** odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS\_Docs/85ccf2d8-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Review Markings:**  
Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
22 May 2009  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009